



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,033	10/12/2000	Howard J. Glaser	STL920000062US1	8030
47069	7590	08/11/2006	EXAMINER	
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP			KENDALL, CHUCK O	
ATTN: IBM54			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210				2192
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212				

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

09/687,033

**Applicant(s)**

GLASER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Chuck O. Kendall

**Art Unit**

2192

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



TODD INGBERG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In Applicant's response of 04/28/06, on page 8 of 12, Applicant argues that Down (6,226,618 B1), does not disclose " defining a user configuration of the application program installation corresponding to a particular user of the application program".

Examiner believes that Downs does in fact teach such limitation. Applicants plain language of claims only calls for configuring the application of the installed program to the particular user. It is Examiners understanding based on his broadest reasonable interpretation that Downs does in fact teach this limitation. As taught in Downs, it is disclosed that:

"Any End-User(s) wishing to purchase downloadable Content 113 downloads and install this package. The installation is self contained in this downloadable package. It unpacks and installs both the Helper Application 198 and the Player Application 195 and also configure the Helper Application 198 to the installed Web Browser(s)" (Down's 80:20 - 25). It is disclosed that the installed application program is configured to the End-User's browser. Applicants claim doesn't preclude or exclude a Browser and hence since the End-User's Brower is configured upon installation Examiner has interpreted this to be equivalent to Applicant's claimed limitation.

Regarding Applicant's argument on page 10 of 12, that Down's does not teach "encrypting and storing the user application program installation configuration in a manes file", Examiner again disagrees.

It is taught in Downs in 66: 40 - 45, that " Each versions of the content that were created by the Encoding Tool is now encrypted", also further on lines 50 - 65, it is also futher disclosed that the content 113 in particular is encrypted and packed, Examiner interprets the packing of the file to be analogous to Applicants manifest file.

Applicant also argues that the "authenticating" and "decrypting", do not appear to be related to the installation of the Helper application 198 on page 11 of 12 of his response. Again, Examiner disagrees. The helper file as taught in Downs in 80:20 - 25, is part of the installation package and it is disclosed that " the Content 113 is being received by the SC(s) Processor 192, it loads the Content 113 data into memory buffers for decryption", in 81:61 - 67. Therefore, the entire package which includes the helper application is decrypted and hence Applicant's limitations are described.



TODD INGBERG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER